



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

defense on the score of originality, as compared with modern writers who get their materials mainly from untraceable sources in literature or life. In the sense implied by this current foolish idea it is probable that originality cannot be claimed for any writer that ever lived. The sole question that can properly be asked in determining the originality of a work of art is, Did the artist make a new thing of his materials. Whether the change required one stroke of pen or brush or chisel or a thousand is of no consequence: the result is all.

Chaucer's attitude toward the corruptions he saw in the world about him seems to me by no means the complacent one expounded by Dr. Root on p. 29. Here again, however, Dr. Root gives us the standard view. That Chaucer does not indulge in thundering denunciation is true, but surely his satire is keener, bitterer, more effective than even that of Langland or Wiclif. He does not allow his indignation to make his verses, because he is too good an artist and too skilful a combatant, but the moral feeling that prompted his satire is unmistakable. A warrior should not be charged with indifference or aloofness from the fray because he prefers to slaughter his enemies with a rapier instead of a pike-staff. Indeed it may be said that the satire of "Piers the Plowman" is most effective when it most resembles Chaucer's in method.

I have dwelt perhaps too long upon defects which after all occupy only a small part of Dr. Root's book. I have done so because whenever a new discussion of Chaucer's work and character appears, it awakens the hope that some of these false notions of Chaucer and the Middle Ages have at last met their deserved fate; and the many excellencies of Dr. Root's book encouraged this hope even more than usual. I should regret it very greatly if disappointment in these matters should lead anyone to believe that this most interesting and useful book is to be rated less highly than is indicated in the opening paragraph of this review.

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Short-Story, Its Principles and Structure. By EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT, M. A. New York: Macmillan, 1907. Pp. viii+260.

Our knowledge of the art of short-story writing is so limited, and contributions to the study of its principles are so few that one dislikes to make any adverse criticisms on an attempt to enlighten one on the literary devices of the short-story. Yet, we believe, Miss Evelyn May Albright's *The Short-Story: Its Principles and Structure*, is hardly worth unqualified admiration. There is little evidence in the book that Miss Albright has pursued a long and laborious course of reading in the short-story, and, moreover, there seems to be some indications that the author has drawn heavily on sources other than her own. We do not mean to suggest that she has "lifted" her material from other books, but rather that she has depended to some extent on the work of others, both in her own classes and in advanced university work, and not on original research. This is, of course, perfectly legitimate, but in a strictly scientific and scholarly investigation, the reader has a right to expect something besides glittering generalities and wide platitudes. An instance in point is Miss Albright's assertion, "the short-story can never, like the novel, give the whole of life. It can

only aim to present, in a vigorous, compressed, suggestive way, a simplification and idealization of a particular part or phase of life." If we correctly understand Miss Albright's generalization we must omit Mr. Henry James's short-stories, for, if we recall that author's "The Lesson of the Master," we find that three of the characters have their life-histories given. "Greville Fane," "The Real Thing," "Sir Dominic Ferrand," "The Chaperon," "Marriages," "The Pupil," "Brooksmith," and other stories by James contain the history of entire lives. Mrs. Mary E. Wilkins Freeman, too, we believe, is not adverse to giving a sketch of the whole life of some of her most delightful characters, among whom we recall Louise Ellis, Joe Daggett, Candace Whitcomb, Polly Moss, Hannah, Betsey Dole, Hetty Fifield, and "Mother." Poe, to cite one more instance, has at least three characters whom he depicts as to their entire lives. Certainly, Miss Albright's assertion is not untrue for the most part, but it is not so accurate as one expects from a professed student of the short-story.

Our quarrel with the author, however, does not stop here. Why should she fall in line with recent criticism and condemn Henry James, Jr., as a writer of short-stories? Why should she say that none "but a pedant will pretend to the keenest interest in them"? This may be true—*de gustibus non est disputandum*—but is it in place in a study proposing to treat the principles and structure of an art practiced by such a man as Henry James, Jr.?

To drop to less important matters, it seems strange to see in print "William Thackeray," and "William Howells," and to see "Mrs. Mary Wilkins Freeman" on one page and two pages further on to see "Mrs. Wilkins Freeman." But our petulant criticism must cease.

Did our space permit we should like to quote the chapter headings of the book. Briefly, the chapters deal with gathering the material, motives, plot, mechanism, unity of impression, titles, characterization, dialogue, the setting, realism, fantasy, the emotional element, and the spirit of the author. The Appendix contains a very suggestive and helpful list of readings, and a few suggestions for assignments of stories and constructive exercises.

H. E. COBLENTZ

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Manual of Composition and Rhetoric. By JOHN HAYS GARDINER, GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE and SARAH LOUISE ARNOLD. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1907. Pp. xi+500.

The names of the authors of *Manual of Composition and Rhetoric* constitute a sufficient guarantee that the book is scholarly and practicable, that it is the outcome of much experience and laborious consultation, and that it will stand the test of the classroom in the hands of an experienced teacher. That it is a good book for a beginner in English is not so evident, but then the authors disarm the critic on this point by stating that it "has been prepared to meet the needs of those teachers and students who require a manual of composition and rhetoric somewhat fuller, and rather more advanced, than the same author's *Elements of English Composition*." The book is admirable for one feature: it will be equally satisfying to those teachers of English who demand that the subject of composition should be related with the "experiences of everyday life on